



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,607	10/30/2001	Lale Elmas White	XI001US	1167
7590	09/14/2007		EXAMINER	
Merle W. Richman, Esq. P.O. Box 3333 La Jolla, CA 92038-3333			LU, CHARLES EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/001,607	WHITE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Charles E. Lu	2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-37 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2-37 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination dated 1/16/2007. Claims 2-37 are pending and rejected.

Response to Amendments/Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments were fully considered. It is noted that Applicants argue the claims as amended. The amendment necessitates a new mapping of the prior art and new grounds of rejection as detailed below.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities.

Dark shading is found on at least **figs. 1, 4, 5A-5G, and 7**. The shading should be removed to improve the clarity of the drawings.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

Art Unit: 2161

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 7, 16, 25, 30, and 34 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 7, 16, 25, and 34, step (j), "correlated the" should be changed to correlated to the.

As to claim 30, it should be made dependent on claim 29 or else claim 30 will be a duplicate claim.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 2-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claim 2, the specification mentions searching and resolving errors, but does not appear to have any support for limitation f).

Claims 3-37 are rejected for similar reasons as claim 2 above.

The broadest reasonable interpretation has been applied to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 2-3, 11-12, 20-21, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Voss (U.S. Patent 5,758,341) hereafter “Voss.”

As to Claim 2, Voss teaches a method comprising:

- a) generating a plurality of error definition records (col. 4, ll. 15-19, 46-55), each error definition record including error defining criteria for determining when a field of a plurality of fields of an accession record of a plurality of accession records (col. 9, ll. 54-56) includes a defined error (col. 4, ll. 15-19, 46-55, col. 9, l. 16 – col. 12, l. 51);
- b) storing the plurality of error definition records in a database (col. 4, ll. 15-19, 50-55);

- c) retrieving one of the plurality of accession records (see above and col. 3, ll. 23-25, col. 9, ll. 55-63);
- d) retrieving one of the plurality of error definition records (see above and col. 4, ll. 50-53, col. 10, ll. 25-27, 58-60);
- e) determining whether a field of the plurality of fields of the retrieved accession record includes an error as defined by the error defining criteria included in the retrieved error definition record (see above and col. 3, ll. 25-36, col. 10, ll. 15-27, 64); and
- f) storing an error indicator in a database for each field of the plurality of fields of a retrieved accession record that includes an error as defined by an error defining criteria included in a retrieved error definition record, the error indicator identifying the error definition record, the accession record, and the field (see above, and col. 10, ll. 15-27, col. 4, ll. 50-53).

As to Claim 3, Voss further teaches that each accession record of the plurality of accession records represents a service request (col. 8, ll. 58-67, col. 9, ll. 54-56).

Claims 11-12, 20-21, and 29-30 are rejected on the same basis as Claims 2-3 discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 4-7, 13-16, 22-25, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereafter “AAPA”). Refer to MPEP § 2129 [R-1] for more information on AAPA.

As to Claims 4-5, Voss teaches operating on accession records composed of a plurality of fields, and error definition records including criteria for a field, as described above.

Voss does not explicitly teach a field indicating the payor.

However, AAPA discloses a field indicating the payor (Specification, p. 1, II. 21-23). Specifically, Applicant’s Specification, p. 1, II. 21-23 discloses, “In some applications, the financially responsible party is a client of the requesting client. Further, the client of the requesting client may have a form of insurance whereby an insurance provider may be responsible for all or some of the billable services.” The insurance provider tracked in the application reads on a field indicating the payor.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the error system of Voss to include checking of a payor field as disclosed by AAPA. The motivation would have been to achieve cost savings, faster speed, uniform results, and shorter maintenance time (Voss, col. 3, II. 37-60; col. 2, II. 56-60) for an application needing a payor field as disclosed by AAPA.

As to Claim 6, Voss as applied above further teaches wherein the plurality of error definition records includes error defining criteria for determining when a field of a plurality of fields includes one of an internal error, unpriceable error, and unbillable error (col. 10, I. 64).

As to Claim 7, Voss as applied above further teaches the following, as discussed above:

- g) generating a plurality of error handling records, each error handling record correlated to a error defining record and defining an error processing procedure (see above);
- h) storing the plurality of error handling records in a database (see above);
 - i) retrieving an error indicator (see above);
 - j) retrieving one of the plurality of error handling records correlated to the error definition record identified by the error indicator (see above); and
 - k) performing the error processing procedure defined in the retrieved one of the error handling records (see above).

Claims 13-16, 22-25, and 31-34 are rejected on the same basis as Claims 4-7 discussed above.

8. Claims 8-10, 17-19, 26-28, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss in view of AAPA, further in view of Ahrens et al (U.S. Patent 6,550,019), hereafter “Ahrens.”

As to claims 8 and 10, Voss and AAPA as applied above teach or suggest an error processing procedure and a payor.

Voss and AAPA do not expressly teach the procedure varying as a function of a payor or the record creation date.

However, it is well known in the art that error processing procedures vary as a function of the type of error and the time of the error. For example, see Ahrens, col. 4, II. 13-15.

Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional for a database record to have a record creation date.

Furthermore, for each error code in Voss, control is transferred to a procedure that works through the specific requirements for the error (col. 10, II. 25-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Voss and AAPA, such that the error processing procedure depends on a payor (e.g., a type of payor) and the record creation date (e.g., date/time). As such, the limitations of claims 8-10 would be met. The motivation would have been to process the errors correctly when records of a different payor and/or date require a different procedure, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 9, Voss, AAPA, and Ahrens as applied above further teach wherein each error processing procedure includes one of automatic matching, manual match, manual, correspondence, outside referral, and hold (col. 10, II. 65-67, also see above).

Claims 17-19, 26-28, and 35-37 are rejected on the same basis as Claims 8-10 discussed above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-8594. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00; M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached at (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/CL/
Assistant Examiner
AU 2161
9/6/2007



APU MOFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER